

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16 have been amended. Claims 18-20 are newly added. The amendment leaves claims 1-20 pending. Consideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grant et al. U.S. Patent 3,524,550. Claim 1 requires first and second axially spaced end caps (e.g. 22 and 24), and requires that the second end cap (24) have an axial flow opening (28) therethrough, and that fluid to be filtered flows laterally (38) through the filter media (30) and axially (40) through the hollow interior (32) of the filter media (30) and the axial flow opening (28). Applying Grant et al. '550, fluid to be filtered flows laterally through filter media 19 into hollow interior 21 and axially through the axial flow opening (unnumbered) in the second end cap (31) to the outlet (17, 18). Claim 1 requires at least one support column (e.g. 42) extending axially in the hollow interior (32) between the end caps (22, 24) and laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28), the column (42) having a hollow sub-interior (46) for receiving a post (50) extending axially thereinto from a base (54) for mounting the filter (20) to the base (54). The Examiner has applied item 21 in Grant et al. '550 as the required column (42) of claim 1.

Amended claim 1 requires that the defined column (42) extend axially in the hollow interior (32) between the end caps (22, 24) and be laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) in non-circumscribing relation. In contrast, item 21 in Grant et al. '550 is in circumscribing relation to the axial flow opening through end cap 31. Consideration and allowance of amended claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grant et al. '550. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 2 requires that the post (50) apply axial compression force between the end caps (22, 24), and that the column (42) supports the axial compression force without the need for inner and outer filter media liners. In contrast, Grant et al. '550 has both an inner

liner (unnumbered) and an outer liner (unnumbered) which support the axial compression force. Consideration and allowance of claim 2 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grant et al. '550. Claim 3 depends from claim 2 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 3 requires that the filter media (30) have no inner liner and no outer liner. In contrast, Grant et al. '550 has an inner liner and outer liner. Consideration and allowance of claim 3 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grant et al. '550. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 4 requires that the second end cap (24) be adjacent the base (54), and that the post (50) extends axially through the column sub-interior (46) to the first end cap (22) and is releasably mounted (74) thereto for applying axial compression force. Consideration and allowance of claim 4 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grant et al. '550. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 5 has been amended and now additionally requires that the seal (84) is laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) in non-circumscribing relation. In contrast, the seal applied in Grant et al. '550 is in circumscribing relation to the axial flow opening. Consideration and allowance of claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grant et al. '550. Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 6 has been amended and now additionally requires that the seal (84) is located on the column (42) in circumscribing relation thereto and in non-circumscribing relation to the axial flow opening (28). This is not taught in Grant et al. '550. Consideration and allowance of claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Grant et al. '550 in view of Kitson U.S. Patent 5,053,129. Claim 7 has been amended and now requires that the first and second sleeves (88 and 90) extend respectively from the first and second end caps

(22 and 24) axially towards each other and engage each other in axially overlapped telescoped non-threaded axially slid able relation, and that one of the sleeves (90) have an annular sealing bead (96) engaging the other sleeve (88) in axially slid able sealing relation providing an axially slid able seal sealing the sub-interior (46) of the column (42) within the sleeves (88, 90) from the interior (32) of the filter media (30) to block contaminant flow therebetween. In contrast, the applied sleeves 26 and 38 in Kitson '129 engage each other in threaded relation, and furthermore are not axially slid able relative to each other nor are they axially slid able in sealing relation providing an axially slid able seal sealing the noted sub-interior. Consideration and allowance of claim 7 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 8-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 7 and define further subcombinations which are believed allowable.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Grant et al. '550 in view of Kitson '129. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 11 requires that the column (42) comprise first and second sleeves (88 and 90) extending respectively from the first and second end caps (22 and 24) axially toward each other and engaging each other in axially overlapped telescoped relation, and that one of the sleeves (88) have a stop (120) engaging the other sleeve (90) and stopping axial travel of the sleeves (88 and 90) toward each other, to provide support for axial compression force. It is respectfully submitted that this is not taught in Grant et al. '550 and Kitson '129. Consideration and allowance of claim 11 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and defines a further subcombination which is believed allowable.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Grant et al. '550 as modified by Kitson '129 and Gachot U.S. Patent 3,578,014 and in further view of Lentz U.S. Patent 1,861,805. Claim 13 has been amended and now additionally requires that the pair of columns (42 and 44) extending axially in the hollow interior (32) of the filter media (30) between the end caps (22 and 24) be laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) on laterally distally opposite sides thereof and in non-circumscribing relation therewith. In

contrast, the applied column 21 in Grant et al. '550 is in circumscribing relation with the axial flow opening through end cap 31. Consideration and allowance of claim 13 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Grant et al. '550 as modified by Kitson '129 and Gachot '014 and in further view of Lentz '805. Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 14 has been amended and now additionally requires that each of the pair of seals (84 and 86) be laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) in non-circumscribing relation, and further that the seals (84 and 86) be laterally spaced from each other on laterally distally opposite sides of the axial flow opening (28). These requirements are not met by the references. Consideration and allowance of claim 14 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 15 depends from claim 13 and defines a further subcombination which is believed allowable.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Grant et al. '550 as modified by Kitson '129 and Gachot '014 in further view of Lentz '805. Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 16 has been amended and now additionally requires that the first and second sleeves (88 and 90) engage each other in axially overlapped telescoped non-threaded axially slid able relation, and that one of the first and second sleeves (90) have a first annular sealing bead (96) engaging the other of the first and second sleeves (88) in axially slid able sealing relation providing an axially slid able seal sealing the sub-interior (46) of the first column (42) within the first and second sleeves (88 and 90) from the hollow interior (32) of the filter media (30) to block contaminant flow therebetween, and further requires that the third and fourth sleeves (92 and 94) engage each other in axially overlapped telescoped non-threaded axially slid able relation, and that one of the third and fourth sleeves (94) have a second annular sealing bead (98) engaging the other of the third and fourth sleeves (92) in axially slid able sealing relation providing an axially slid able seal sealing the sub-interior (48) of the second column (44) within the third and fourth sleeves (92 and 94) from the interior (32) of

the filter media (30) to block contaminant flow therebetween. These limitations are not met by the references. Consideration and allowance of claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and defines a subcombination which is believed allowable.

Newly added claim 18 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 18 additionally requires that the hollow interior (32) of the filter media (30) and the axial flow opening (28) in the second end cap (24) be in axial alignment (26), and further that the post (50) be laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) and axially non-aligned therewith and offset therefrom. These requirements are not met by the references. Consideration and allowance of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

Newly added claim 19 depends from claim 14 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 19 additionally requires that the first seal (84) be located on the first column (42) in circumscribing relation thereto and in non-circumscribing relation to the axial flow opening (28), and that the second seal (86) be located on the second column (44) in circumscribing relation thereto and in non-circumscribing relation to the axial flow opening (28). These requirements are not met by the references. Consideration and allowance of claim 19 is earnestly solicited.

Newly added claim 20 depends from claim 13 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 20 additionally requires that the hollow interior (32) of the filter media (30) and the axial flow opening (28) in the second end cap (24) be in axial alignment (26), and that the first post (50) be laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) and axially non-aligned therewith and offset therefrom, and that the second post (52) be laterally spaced from the axial flow opening (28) and axially non-aligned therewith and offset therefrom and also be laterally spaced from the first post (50) and axially non-aligned therewith and offset therefrom. These limitations are not met by the references. Consideration and allowance of claim 20 is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/629,433
Amendment dated October 12, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 10, 2005

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance with claims 1-20, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

Michael E. Taken

Michael E. Taken
(Reg. No. 28,120)

100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 271-7590